

1. Introduction

The Arctic is especially sensitive to global climate change, and over the last century has experienced anomalous warming (Serreze et al., 2000; Peterson et al., 2002; Semiletov et al., 2004). Past and future increases in atmospheric and surface water temperatures should, with time, lead to significant warming of intermediate to deep waters (Dmitrenko et al., 2008; Spielhagen et al., 2011), as well as sediment beneath the seafloor (Reagan and Moridis, 2009; Phrampus et al., 2014). The latter is both fascinating and worrisome, because pore space within the upper few hundreds of meters of sediment along many continental slopes can contain large 49 amounts of temperature-sensitive methane (CH₄) in the form of gas hydrates, free gas, and dissolved gas (Kvenvolden, 1993 and 2001; Beaudoin et al., 2014). Consequently, numerous papers have discussed the potential impact of future warming upon CH4 within slope sequences of the Arctic Ocean (Paull et al., 1991; Archer, 2007; Reagan and Moridis, 2008; McGuire et al., 2009; Biastoch et al., 2011; Elliott et al., 2011; Ferré et al., 2012; Giustiniani et al., 2013; Thatcher et al., 2013; Stranne et al., 2016). Globally, the amount and distribution of CH4 in sediment along continental slopes remains poorly constrained (Beaudoin et al., 2014). This is particularly true for the Arctic Ocean, because ice cover makes accessibility to many regions difficult. Nonetheless, numerous papers have inferred enormous quantities of gas hydrate surrounding the Arctic (Kvenvolden and Grantz, 1990; Max and Lowrie, 1993; Buffett and Archer, 2004; Klauda and Sandler, 2005; Max and Johnson, 2012; Wallmann et al., 2012; Piñero et al., 2013; Fig. 1 and 2). In some sectors, 61 compelling evidence exists for abundant sedimentary CH_4 and gas hydrate. Bottom simulating reflectors (BSRs) on seismic profiles generally mark the transition between overlying gas hydrate and underlying free gas (Holbrook et al., 1996; Pecher et al., 2001), and thereby imply

high quantities of CH4 in pore space (Dickens et al., 1997; Pecher et al., 2001). Such BSRs have been documented along the North Slope of Alaska (Collett, 2002; Collett et al., 2010), within the Beaufort Sea (Grantz et al., 1976; Grantz et al., 1982; Weaver and Stewart, 1982; Hart et al., 2011; Phrampus et al., 2014), around Canadian Arctic Islands (Judge, 1982; Hyndman and Dallimore, 2001; Majorowicz and Osadetz, 2001; Yamamoto and Dallimore, 2008), adjacent to Svalbard (Eiken and Hinz, 1993; Posewang and Mienert, 1999; Vanneste et al., 2005; Hustoft et al., 2009; Petersen et al., 2010), and within the Barents Sea (Andreassen et al. 1990; Løvø et al., 1990; Laberg and Andreassen, 1996; Laberg et al., 1998; Chand et al., 2008; Ostanin et al., 2013). Furthermore, Lorenson and Kvenvolden (1995) observed high CH4 concentrations in shelf waters of the Beaufort Sea, and Shakhova (2010a, 2010b) have documented CH4 escape to the water column above the East Siberian shelf. It generally has been assumed that sediment on the ESM slope contains copious CH4 and gas hydrate (Fig. 1), although there is little data to support or refute this idea.

Regional assessments for the presence of abundant CH4 in marine sediment can be acquired through two general approaches. The first includes geophysical applications, primarily seismic reflection profiling and the recognition of BSRs (MacKay et al., 1994; Carcione and Tinivella, 2000; Haacke et al., 2008), which are a common, but not ubiquitous feature, of hydrate bearing sediments. The second utilizes chemical analyses of pore waters obtained from sediment cores (Borowski et el., 1996; Borowski et al., 1999; Kastner et al., 2008b; Dickens and Snyder 2009). In marine sediments with abundant CH4, a general and important process occurs near the 84 seafloor; typically, within the upper 30 m. Microbes utilize upward migrating CH_4 and 85 downward diffusing sulfate (SO_4^2) via anaerobic oxidation of methane (AOM; e.g., Barnes and Goldberg, 1976; Reeburgh, 1976; Devol and Ahmed, 1981; Boetius et al., 2000):

2. Background

2.1 East Siberian margin geology

Extensive continental shelves and their associated slopes nearly encircle the Arctic Ocean (**Figure 1**). Although it represents only 2.6% of the world's ocean by area (Jakobsson, 2002), the present Arctic Ocean receives approximately 10% of the global freshwater input (Stein, 2008) as

well as corresponding massive discharge of terrigenous material (>249 Mt/yr; Holmes et al., 2002). Only Fram Strait allows deep-water flow to and from the Arctic Ocean. This strait, located between Greenland and Svalbard (Fig. 1), has a modern sill depth of about 2540 m (Jakobsson et al., 2003). It opened during the early to middle Miocene (Jakobsson et al., 2007; Engen et al., 2008; Hustoft et al., 2009). Prior to this, the Arctic Ocean only was connected to other oceans through shallow seaways (e.g., Turgay Straight), such that deep waters may have been anoxic for long intervals of the Cretaceous and Paleogene (Clark, 1988; O'Regan et al., 2011).

The ESM is defined here to comprise the margin of the East Siberian Sea, which stretches between Wrangel Island to the east and the New Siberian Islands to the west (Fig. 2). We include the adjacent Chukchi and East Siberian Sea (CESS) continental slope in the ESM. This continental shelf within this region is the widest in the world, extending 1500 km north from the 122 coast. The enormous swath laying in water depths less than 100 m (\sim 987 x 10^3 km^2 ; Jakobsson, 123 2002) was likely covered in km-thick ice shelf during marine isotope stage 6×140 ka), contributing to extensive formation of submarine permafrost (Judge, 1982; Weaver and Stewart, 1982; Løvø et al., 1990; Collett et al., 2010; Jakobsson et al., 2016). The expansive shelf contrasts with the relatively narrow continental slope, which intersects two ridge systems, Mendeleev Ridge to the east and Lomonosov Ridge to the west (Jakobsson et al., 2008). Bounded by these two ridge systems, the steep ESM slope leads into the gently sloping Chukchi, Arlis, and Wrangel perched continental rises (Jakobsson et al., 2003).

2.2 Regional oceanography

Expedition (Backman et al., 2009) drilled and cored the central Lomonosov Ridge (Fig. 1). There

are also land based studies (Gualtier et al., 2005; Sher et al., 2005; Andreev et al., 2009), and some public oil and gas exploration material, which provides indirect data on the shelf (Hovland and Svensen, 2006).

Despite the paucity of ground-truth data, many researchers have predicted widespread and abundant CH4 along the CESS continental slope, as clearly shown by maps of conjectured gas hydrate distribution in the Arctic (Fig. 1). This inference has arisen for two main reasons. First, the integrated input of particulate organic carbon (POC) over time provides the ultimate source of CH4 in marine sediments (Kvenvolden and Grantz, 1990). Arctic slopes may contain high POC contents, which accumulated prior to the opening of the Fram Strait (Jokat and Ickrath, 2015), or along with terrigenous material during interglacial intervals of the Quaternary (Danyushevskaya et al., 1980; Clark, 1988; Darby, 1989; Moran et al., 2006; Archer, 2015). Certainly, organic rich Eocene sediments have been documented on other Arctic margins and in the ACEX cores on Lomonosov Ridge (Moran et al., 2006; Backman and Moran, 2009; O'Regan et al., 2011, Alekseev, 1997; Naidu et al., 2000; Niessen et al., 2013). Second, the thickness of the gas hydrate stability zone (GHSZ) depends on bottom water temperature and the geothermal gradient (Dickens, 2001). Because of very low bottom water temperatures along the slope and low regional geothermal gradients (O'Regan et al., 2016); an extensive volume of sediment can host gas hydrate (Miles, 1995; Makogon, 2010).

2.4 Pore water chemistry above methane-charged sediment sequences

Pore water chemistry profiles provide a powerful means to constrain CH4 abundance and fluxes in marine sediment sequences (Borowski et al., 1996; Berg et al., 1998; Jørgensen et al., 2001; Torres and Kastner, 2009; Treude et al., 2014). Such profiles are generated by extracting interstitial water samples from sediment cores, and then measuring concentrations of dissolved species.

In regions without significant advection of water, pore water profiles of various analytes relate to Fick's law of diffusion and chemical reactions (e.g., Berner, 1977; Froelich et al., 1979; Klump and Martens 1981; Boudreau, 1997; and Iverson and Jorgensen, 1993). The flux (*J*) of a dissolved species through porous marine sediment can be calculated from the concentration gradient by (Li & Gregory, 1974; Berner, 1975; Lerman, 1977):

$$
185 \t J = -\varphi Ds \frac{\partial C}{\partial Z}, \t(2)
$$

186 where φ is porosity, D_s is the diffusivity of an ion in sediment at a specified temperature, C is concentration, and *Z* is depth. Note that, as generally written, *J* is positive for upward fluxes and 188 negative for downward fluxes relative to the seafloor. In many locations, φ and D_s change only moderately (<20%) in the upper tens of meters below the seafloor. However, abundant CH4 in sediment necessarily leads to a large concentration gradient toward the seafloor and a major 191 upward flux of CH4. The consequent reaction with SO_4^2 via AOM (Eqn. 1) thus leads to a series of flux changes in dissolved components (addition or removal), and predictable variations in corresponding concentration profiles across a SMT (Alperin, 1988; Borowski et al., 1996; Niewohner et al., 1998; Ussler and Paull, 2008; Dickens and Snyder, 2009; Chatterjee et al., 2011; Regnier et al., 2011). In such regions, the depth of the SMT directly relates to the flux of CH4 from below (Jørgensen et al., 1990; Dickens, 2001; D'Hondt et al., 2002; Hensen et al., 197 2003), largely because SO_4^2 concentrations at the seafloor are nearly constant throughout the oceans.

Alternatively, at seafloor locations with significant upward advection of fluids, such as above faults, pore water profiles become more complicated to model (Torres et al., 2002). This is because multiphase fluid flow (free gas and liquid) rarely reaches steady-state. Additionally, both steady and pulsed multiphase flow physically alters sediments creating soupy or mousse-like textures and sometimes gas pockets. However, if the upward advecting fluids contain significant 204 CH₄ (and no SO₄²), the SMT shoals toward the seafloor with respect to predictions from considerations of CH4 diffusion alone (Dickens, 2001). This can be observed generally from the very shallow SMTs observed at locations of CH4 seepage worldwide (e.g., Aharon and Fu, 2000).

208 Typically, in all regions and at many locations, the SMT is a thin $(\leq 3 \text{ m})$ depth horizon 209 with major inflections in both CH₄ and SO_4^2 profiles (Fig. 3). Sulfate concentrations decrease from seawater values at the seafloor to zero at the SMT; by contrast, CH4 concentrations rise 211 from zero at the SMT to elevated values at depth.

Importantly, though, as one can infer from Equations 1 and 2, AOM affects additional species dissolved in pore water (Alperin et al., 1988; Jørgensen et al., 1990; Dickens, 2001; 214 Hensen et al., 2003; Snyder et al., 2007). Dissolved HS⁻ and HCO₃⁻ concentrations necessarily increase across the SMT, so an inflection occurs in their concentration profiles. These two species contribute to total alkalinity of marine waters (Gieskes and Rogers, 1973; Haraldsson et al., 1997), which can be defined as:

218
$$
Alk_T = [HCO_3^-] + 2[CO_3^{2-}] + [HS^-] + [B(OH)_4^-] + [OH^-] + [HPO_4^{2-}] + [NH_3] +
$$

219 [X], (3)

where X refers to several minor species. However, in shallow sediments found above almost all CH4 charged systems, this can be expressed as:

 $Alk_T \approx [HCO_3^-] + [HS^-],$ (4)

sediment sequences with significant CH4, including gas hydrate, in the upper few hundred meters below the seafloor (Fig. 3). Good examples include: Baltic Sea (Jørgensen et al, 1990), Black

3. Materials and Methods

3.1 SWERUS-C3 Expedition, Leg 2

Leg 2 of SWERUS-C3 included four transects across the CESS continental slope (Fig. 2). These transects were along Arlis Spur (TR-1), north of central East Siberia (TR-2), from close to Henrietta Island to the Makarov Basin (TR-3), and on the Amerasian side of Lomonosov Ridge (TR-4). Along each transect, scientific operations involved bathymetric mapping as well as sediment coring at a series of stations. An additional coring station was located on Lomonosov Ridge, near where this bathymetric high intersects the ESM.

An array of coring techniques were used along each transect. In total, 50 sediment cores were collected at 34 coring stations. These included: multicore sets (22), gravity cores (23), piston cores (11), and kasten cores (2). The multicorer was an 8-tube corer built by Oktopus

GmbH weighing 500kg. The polycarbonate liners were 60 cm long with a 10 cm diameter. The piston/gravity coring system was built by Stockholm University with an inner diameter of 10 cm. Trigger weight cores also were collected during piston coring. The different coring systems enabled sediment and pore water collection from the seafloor to upwards of nine m below the seafloor (mbsf).

3.2 Core material

Sediment physical properties on gravity and piston cores were analyzed on the ship using a Geotek Multi-Sensor Core Logger (MSCL). Measurements of the gamma-ray derived bulk density, compressional wave velocity (p-wave), and magnetic susceptibility were acquired at a down core resolution of one cm. Discrete samples (2-3 per section) also were collected for sediment index property measurements (bulk density, porosity, water content and grain density). Grain density was measured using a helium displacement pycnometer on oven-dried samples. 282 Porosity profiles were generated using the smoothed $(3$ -pt) MSCL-derived bulk density (ρ_B) and 283 the average grain density (ρ_g) from each core, where

$$
\varphi = \frac{(\rho_g - \rho_b)}{(\rho_b - \rho_f)},\tag{5}
$$

285 and an assumed pore fluid density (ρ_f) of 1.024 g/cm³.

3.3 Interstitial water collection

Pore waters were collected using Rhizon samplers (Seeberg-Elverfeldt et al., 2005; Dickens 289 et al., 2007). Cores were cut into \sim 1.5 m long sections immediately on the ship deck, brought to the geochemistry laboratory, and placed on precut racks. Laboratory temperature was a near 291 constant 22 °C. Sampling involved drilling holes through the core liner, inserting Rhizons into

the sediment core, and obtaining small volumes of pore water via vacuum and "microfiltration."

The Rhizons used were 5-cm porous flat tip male luer lock (19.21.23) with 12 cm tubing,

purchased from Rhizosphere Research Products (www.rhizosphere.com).

In total, 529 pore water samples were collected from 32 cores, which ranged from 0.16 to 8.43 m in length (Tbl. S2). Rhizons in gravity and piston cores typically were spaced every 20 to 297 30 cm. Because the use of rhizon sampling for collecting pore waters of deep-sea sediments remains a relatively novel and engaging topic (Dickens, 2007), we discuss the procedure, as well as several experiments regarding our sampling, in the supplementary information document. While in the shipboard laboratory, Rhizon samples were divided into six aliquots when

sufficient water was available. This sample splitting led to 2465 aliquots of pore water in total, which then could be examined for different species and at different laboratories. Aliquots 1, 3, and 6 (below) were collected for all 32 cores.

3.4 Interstitial water analyses

The first aliquot was used to measure total alkalinity using a Mettler Toledo titrator onboard *IB Oden*. Immediately after collection, pore water was diluted with milli-Q water and autotitrated. Fifteen spiked samples and eight duplicates were analyzed onboard for quality control. Spiked samples were created by pipetting certified reference material (Batch 135; www.cdiac.ornl.gov/oceans/Dickson_CRM) into milli-Q water. Results for spiked samples and duplicates are reported in Table 1.

312 The second aliquot was used to measure the δ^{13} C composition of DIC (δ^{13} C-DIC). Septum sealed glass vials prepared with H3PO4 and flushed with helium were prepared before the expedition. Samples were sealed in boxes and refrigerated for the remainder of the cruise. Four

field duplicates, two seawater standards, and a field blank were collected, stored, and analyzed 316 with the samples. The δ^{13} C-DIC analyses were performed on a Gasbench II coupled to a MAT 253 Mass Spectrometer (both Thermo Scientific) at Stockholm University. The δ^{13} C-DIC is reported in conventional delta notation relative to Vienna PeeDee Belemnite (VPDB). Results for field duplicates and standards are reported in Table 1. Standard deviation for the analyses of δ^{13} C-DIC was less than 0.1 ‰.

The third aliquot was used to measure dissolved sulfur and metal concentrations. Samples were acid preserved with 10 μL ultrapure HNO3. Additionally, 11 blind field duplicates and 2 field blanks were collected and processed in the same manner. Concentrations of Ba, Ca, Fe, Mg, Mn, S, and Sr were determined on an Agilent Vista Pro Inductively Coupled Atomic Emission Spectrometer (ICP-AES) in the geochemistry facilities at Rice University. Known standard solutions and pore fluid samples were diluted 1:20 with 18-MΩ water. Scandium was added to both standards and samples to correct for instrumental drift (emission line 361.383 nm). Wavelengths used for elemental analysis followed those indicated by Murray et al. (2000). 329 Following initial analysis, an additional dilution, 1:80 with 18-M Ω water, was analyzed for Ca, Mg, and S. After every 10 analyses, an International Association of Physical Sciences (IAPSO) standard seawater spiked sample and a blank were examined for quality control. Relative standard deviations (RSD) from stock solutions are reported in Table 1. 333 The fourth aliquot was used to measure dissolved ammonia $(NH₄⁺)$ via a colorimetric method similar to that presented by Gieskes et al. (1991). Set volumes of pore water were pipetted into cuvettes and diluted with milli-Q water. Two reagents were then pipetted into the 336 cuvettes. Reagent A was prepared by adding $Na_3C_6H_5O_7$, C_6H_5OH , and $Na_2(Fe(CN)_5NO)$ to

milli-Q water. Reagent B was prepared by dissolving NaOH in milli-Q water and adding NaClO

solution. Solutions were mixed and allowed to react for at least six but not more than 24 hours. 339 Solutions turned various shades of blue, which to relate to NH_4^+ concentration, and were measured by absorbance at 630 nm on a Hitachi U-1100 spectrophotometer. Five point calibration curves were measured before each sample set and corrected using VKI standard (QC RW1; www.eurofins.dk; Table 1).

343 The fifth aliquot was used to measure dissolved phosphate (PO_4^3) following the method given by Gieskes et al. (1991). Remaining pore water (generally between 1 and 3mL) was added 345 to milli-Q water to a sum of 10 mL. Two reagents were added to the solution to react with PO_4^{3-} . 346 Reagent A was prepared by making three solutions: (NH_4) ₂MoO₄, H_2SO_4 , and $C_8H_4K_2O_{12}Sb_2$ • XH2O were added to milli-Q water, and the solutions were added dropwise. Reagent B was 348 created with C₆H₈O₆. After samples were prepared, reagents A and B were added, mixed, and 349 allowed to react 30 minutes. Solutions turned various shades of blue, relating to $PO4³$ concentration, and were measured at an absorbance of 880 nm. Five point calibration curves were measured before each sample set and corrected using VKI standard (QC www.eurofins.dk; Table 1).

For 352 pore water samples, a sixth aliquot of approximately 2 mL could be collected to 354 mix with 200 μL of a 2.5% Zn-acetate $(Zn(C_2H_3O_2)_2)$ solution. Given the extremely low solubility of ZnS, when such a solution is added to pore water samples, a white precipitate should form in the presence of even very low H2S concentrations (Cline, 1969; Goldhaber, 1974).

A method detection limit (MDL) for each species can be determined by the following equation:

$$
MDL = \left(\frac{c_{High} - c_{Low}}{l_{High} - l_{Low}}\right) 3\sigma\,,\tag{6}
$$

4. Results

4.1 Broad conclusions

With the large number of pore water measurements (Tbl. S1), we begin with some generalities regarding results. We plot pore water concentration profiles along each transect collectively (Fig. 4-8), irrespective of coring device or water depth, although clear variance in pore water chemistry exists between stations for some dissolved species (e.g., Fe). Most species display "smooth" concentration profiles with respect to sediment depth (Fig. 4-8). That is, concentrations of successive samples do not display a high degree of scatter. This is expected for pore water profiles in sediment where diffusion dominates (Froelich et al., 1979; Klump and Martens 1981; Schulz, 2000; Torres and Kastner, 2009; Hu et al., 2015). However, for some dissolved species whose concentrations do not appreciably change over depth (e.g., Ba^{2+} and Ca^{2+}), scatter exists beyond that predicted from analytical precision. We discuss this in detail in the supplementary information.

381 \qquad 4.2 Alkalinity and $\delta^{13}C$ of DIC

Alkalinity concentrations increase with depth in all cores (Fig. 4-8). Moreover, in most cases, the rise is roughly linear. Across all stations on the four transects, alkalinity increases by

an average of 0.51 mM/m, although variance exists between mean gradients for each transect $(Tr1 = 0.46 \text{ mM/m}, Tr2 = 0.34 \text{ mM/m}, Tr3 = 0.91 \text{ mM/m}, \text{and Tr4} = 0.44 \text{ mM/m}$ and by station along each transect. Overall, the rise in alkalinity at these 15 stations ranges from 0.30 to 0.98 mM/m. The Lomonosov Ridge station differs (Fig. 8), as alkalinity increases much greater with depth (1.86 mM/m).

389 Concave-down δ^{13} C-DIC profiles characterize pore waters at all stations (Fig. 4-8). The 390 decrease in δ^{13} C-DIC is most pronounced near the seafloor. Across all stations along the four 391 transects, pore water δ^{13} C-DIC values decrease from near zero close to the mudline at an average 392 of -3.6 ‰/m. Again, variance in mean gradients occurs according to stations and transects (Tr1 = 393 -3.3 ‰/m, Tr2 = -3.0 ‰/m, and Tr3 = -4.7 ‰/m). As with alkalinity, the δ^{13} C-DIC profile at the 394 Lomonosov Ridge station differs, with values decreasing by 5.6 ‰/m, such that by eight mbsf, δ^{13} C-DIC approaches -45 ‰. In summary, a basic relationship exists between higher alkalinity 396 and lower δ^{13} C-DIC across all stations.

397

398 *4.3 Sulfur and sulfate*

No sulfide was observed by smell and no ZnS precipitated in any pore water sample upon addition of Zn-acetate solution. Molar concentrations of total dissolved sulfur should, therefore, 401 represent those of dissolved SO_4^2 . Along the four transects, dissolved S concentrations decrease with depth at all stations (Fig. 4-7). The total dissolved S concentrations in the shallowest samples varied from 27.3 to 30.6 mM and averaged 28.7 mM. From these "seafloor" values, concentrations decrease by an average 0.69 mM/m, again with variance according to stations and 405 transect (Tr1 = -0.58 mM/m, Tr2 = -0.57 mM/m, Tr3 = -1.09 mM/m; and Tr4 = -0.60 mM/m). The dissolved S gradients across all stations along the CESS slope range from -0.41 to -1.13

430 the peak in HPO₄² concentrations at four stations. At the two shallow stations, S12 (384 m) and 431 S22 (367 m) the HPO₄²⁻ maxima are, 73 μ M (1.91 m) and 18 μ M (0.66 m), respectively, but at 432 the two deeper stations, S17 (977 m) and S14 (733 m), the HPO 4^2 maxima are only 6.7 μ M (1.76 433 m) and 7.1 μM (2.33 m) respectively. The station on Lomonosov Ridge (S31) has a high in 434 HPO₄²⁻ concentration of 76 μ M at 1.02 m below the mudline. In general, stations with more 435 pronounced $HPO₄²$ maxima also have greater increases in alkalinity with depth. 436 The NH₄⁺, HPO₄²⁻, and alkalinity profiles relate to one another statistically, although with 437 distinction. All stations have a C:N ratio in pore waters much higher than the canonical Redfield 438 Ratio of 6.625 (Fig. 10). Rather, the concentration relationship of alkalinity and ammonium ion 439 can be expressed by a second order polynomial $([NH_4^+] = -0.003[A1k]^2 + 0.105[A1k] - 0.253;$ 440 Fig. 9b) with an average molar ratio $(\Delta A \frac{1}{\Delta N} \frac{H_4}{I})$ of 14.7, close to what might be expected for 441 degradation of terrestrial organic carbon. Interestingly, this ratio deviates somewhat across 442 transects, increasing at sites from Tr1, Tr3, Tr2, to the Lomonosov Ridge station. The molar ratio 443 of alkalinity to phosphate ion $(AAIk/AHPO₄²)$ averages 55.7 for all stations. This ratio also 444 generally increases in cores from east to west.

445

446 *4.5 Metals*

At most stations, dissolved Ba^{2+} concentrations increase nonlinearly from values at or 448 below detection limit (0.01 μM) near the seafloor to generally constant values $(0.6 - 0.7 \mu M)$ 449 within 0.8 m below the seafloor. However, at several stations, dissolved Ba^{2+} concentrations 450 remains at or below the detection limit for all samples.

451 Overall, dissolved Ca^{2+} , Mg²⁺, and Sr²⁺ concentrations decrease slightly with depth (Fig. 4-452 8). Across stations along the four transects, Ca^{2+} concentrations drop on average between -0.09

questioned the accuracy and precision of analyses obtained through this approach (e.g., Schrum

et al., 2012; Miller et al., 2014). Two experiments conducted during the SWERUS-C3 Leg 2 Expedition using the Rhizons suggest that part of the problem concerns the timing and location of sampling (Supplementary Materials). Notably, however, as clearly documented in previous works (Seeberg-Elverfeldt et al., 2005; Dickens et al., 2007; Pohlman et al., 2008), rhizon sampling can lead to "smooth" concentration profiles for multiple dissolved species, including alkalinity (Fig. 4-8).

Concerns about rhizon sampling may be valid for dissolved components when concentration gradients are very low. For example, Schrum et al. (2012) stressed alkalinity differences between samples collected at similar depth using rhizon sampling and conventional squeezing. However, the total alkalinity range in this study was between 1.6 and 2.6 mM, and 486 typical differences were 0.06 mM. A similar finding occurs in the dissolved Ca^{2+} and Ba^{2+} profiles of this study, where the range in values is small and adjacent samples deviate by more than analytical precision (Tbl. 1, Fig. S3). However, when the signal to noise ratio becomes high, as true with most dissolved components at most stations (Fig. 4-8), the rhizon sampling renders pore water profiles with well-defined concentration gradients that can be interpreted in terms of chemical reactions and fluxes.

5.2 General absence of methane

Direct measurements of dissolved CH4 in deep-sea sediment are complicated (Claypool and Kvenvolden 1983). During core retrieval and depressurization, significant CH4 loss can occur 496 from pore space (Dickens et al., 1997). Moreover, in sediments containing high CH₄

concentrations and recovered through piston coring, such gas release typically generates sub-

498 horizontal cracks that span the core between the liner. No such cracks were documented in any 499 of the cores.

500 Excluding Station St31 on the southern Lomonosov Ridge (discussed below), there is no 501 indication of a shallow SMT. Interstitial water sulfur concentrations do not drop below 22.8 mM 502 within the upper 8 m. In fact, calculated downward $SO₄²$ fluxes, as inferred from sulfur 503 concentration gradients (Tbl. 2) range from -1.8 to -6.2 mol/m²-kyr for all stations except Station 504 S31. For comparison, a site with a near seafloor temperature of $2^{\circ}C$ (Fig. S2) and porosities 505 similar to those measured (Fig. S1), an SMT at 6.0 mbsf would imply a SO_4^2 -flux of -40 506 $\text{mol/m}^2\text{-kyr}$.

507 Given the lack of HS⁻ and the measured pH at Station S33 (Fig. S2), alkalinity should 508 closely approximate HCO₃ concentrations (Equation 4). Estimated HCO₃ fluxes (*J*HCO₃) do 509 not exceed 6.8 mol/m²-kyr at any station east of the Lomonosov Ridge (Tbl. 2). For comparison, 510 at sites with abundant CH₄ at depth, *J*HCO₃ generally exceeds 30 mol/m²-kyr above the SMT 511 (Tbl. 2). These extreme fluxes arise because methanogenesis in deeper sediment drives an 512 upward flux of HCO_3^- (Fig. 3), and because AOM contributes additional HCO_3^- and HS⁻ to pore 513 water at the SMT (Eqn. 1).

514 The δ^{13} C-DIC values of pore water decrease with depth at all stations, almost in concert with the rise in alkalinity, implying no CH4 production because methanogenesis would increase δ^{13} C-DIC values (Fig. 9c; Whiticar, 1999). Other than Station S31, the lowest value of δ^{13} C-DIC is -25.23 ‰ at 5.5 m at Station S22 (Fig. 6). This is interesting because a series of microbial 518 reactions utilizing particulate organic matter (POM) can lead to higher alkalinity and lower δ^{13} C-DIC values in pore water. The most important of these reactions is organoclastic sulfate reduction (OSR), which can be expressed as (Berner, 1980; Boudreau and Westrich, 1984):

$$
2CH2O + SO42 \rightarrow H2S + 2HCO3 , \qquad (7)
$$

Notably, this reaction has a 2:1 relationship between C and S fluxes, rather than the 1:1 ratio of AOM (Eqn. 1).

As emphasized previously, methane-charged sediment sequences do occur on continental slopes in the Arctic. Of particular interest to this study are locations in the Beaufort Sea, where indications for gas hydrate manifest on seismic profiles (Grantz et al., 1976; Grantz et al., 1982; Weaver and Stewart, 1982; Hart et al., 2011; Phrampus et al., 2014), and pore water profiles have been generated using shallow piston cores (Coffin et al., 2013). Striking contrasts exist between pore water profiles of the Beaufort Sea and those of the CESS (Tbl. 2). In the Beaufort 530 Sea, there are moderate to high downward SO_4^2 and upward CH₄ fluxes (1.9 to 154.8 mol/m²-kyr), shallow SMTs (6.29 to 1.06 mbsf), high DIC fluxes between the SMT and the mudline 532 (46.3 to 242.6), and negative δ^{13} C-DIC values at SMT's (\approx -20‰).

5.3 Special case "Lomonosov Ridge station"

Station 31 on the Lomonosov Ridge (Fig. 8) differs from all other stations examined in 536 this study. Here, pore water chemistry profiles hint at CH₄ in pore space within shallow sediment. Extrapolation of the dissolved sulfur profile suggests an SMT at approximately 14 mbsf. Such a depth lies within the range common for locations with AOM (D'Hondt et al., 2002), notably including well studied sites on Blake Ridge (Borowski et al., 1999). Similar to some sites with CH₄, the δ¹³C-DIC values become very "light"; indeed, the value at the base of the core, -43.5‰, almost necessitates CH4 oxidation within shallow sediment. Comparably steep alkalinity (1.6 mM/m) and NH4 gradients (60.4 μM/m) also characterize most sites with CH4 near the seafloor. However, there is an issue concerning reduced sulfur, which is a product of

544 AOM (Eqn. 1). If AOM was occurring at \sim 13.9 mbsf, one might expect evidence for HS⁻ migrating from below (Fig. 3). No ZnS precipitated in pore waters of this core upon addition of ZnAc.

547 A comparison of published DIC fluxes, SO_4^2 fluxes, and SMT depths (Tbl. 2) reveals fluxes decrease exponentially with SMT depth (Fig. 11). In fact, a fundamental relationship exists when one considers that upward CH4 fluxes control the SMT depth (Eqn. 1; Fig. 3). The 550 modest SO₄² flux (-13.9 mol/m²-kyr) and alkalinity flux (11.3 mol/m²-kyr) estimated for the Lomonosov Ridge station conform to those expected for an SMT at about 14 mbsf. For example, 552 Hensen et al. (2003) calculated a SO_4^2 flux of -14.7 mol/m²-kyr for a site with an SMT at 14 553 mbsf in the Argentine Basin, and Berg (2008) calculated a SO_4^2 - flux of -8.05 mol/m²-kyr for a site with an SMT at 16 mbsf along the Costa Rica Margin.

5.4 Other chemistry

Microbial communities preferentially utilize the most energetically favorable oxidant available, which leads to a characteristic sequence of reactions in marine sediment (Froelich et al., 1979; Berner, 1980; D'Hondt et al., 2004; Miller et al., 2012). With increasing depth below the seafloor, these reactions are: aerobic respiration, denitrification, manganese oxide reduction, 561 iron oxide reduction, SO_4^2 reduction, and finally methanogenesis. Importantly, depths dominated by these reactions generally depend on the supply of POM to the seafloor, and these reactions impact pore water chemistry.

Many of the cores collected along the CESS slope appear to terminate in the zone of metal oxide reduction. This is because, at most stations, Mn and Fe profiles are still increasing at the bottom of the sampled interval (Fig. 4-8) which may be due to dissimilatory Mn- and Fe-

oxide reduction. However, Mn in particular may be more complicated. März et al., (2011) find evidence from Mn profiles along the southern Mendeleev Ridge which may reflect diagenetic remobilization and diffusion from deeper sediments. The relatively deep depths of metal oxide reduction nevertheless, are consistent with a relatively low input of POM to the seafloor, and generally contrast with sites of high CH4 concentrations in shallow sediment. From a simple perspective, there may be insufficient POC to drive methanogenesis near the seafloor.

The station on the Lomonosov Ridge again stands apart. Here, Mn and Fe concentrations reach maxima at 1.3 mbsf and 0.5 mbsf, respectively, and decrease below. This is likely due to Mn and Fe produced during dissimilatory oxide reduction occurring below consumption. Thus, the Lomonosov Ridge site appears to have higher organic turnover and possibly more organic burial than all the other locations.

Presumably, organic matter ultimately mineralized as CH4 in Arctic sediments is produced during warm periods. Before the opening of the Fram Strait, ocean water stratification was likely pronounced, causing widespread anoxia. Bottom water anoxia created optimal conditions for organic matter preservation. During the current interglacial, however, organic matter deposition in the ESM is seasonal and small. The relationship of alkalinity to ammonia in Figure 10 exceeds the Redfield ratio of the average marine organic matter. Therefore, the source of much of the organic matter on the continental slope may be terrestrial rather than marine.

5.5 Signatures of AOM and OSR

587 Some authors have used changes in DIC and $SO₄²$ concentrations between the seafloor and the SMT to infer the relative importance of AOM and OSR in marine sediments (Kastner et al. 2008b; Luo et al. 2013; Hu et al. 2015). This idea can be expressed by comparing

Rather than just comparing changes in C:S molar ratios, to interrogate the importance of 600 the two reactions, one might also incorporate δ^{13} C-DIC value. This is because δ^{13} C-DIC values and the depth of DIC production differ considerably for AOM, OSR and methanogenesis at many locations. We generate a figure expressing these relationships at multiple sites (Fig. 12), where the y-axis is:

$$
\frac{\Delta(DIC + Ca^{2+} + Mg^{2+})}{\Delta(SO_4^{2-})},\tag{8}
$$

604 and the x-axis is: DIC* δ^{13} C-DIC. The C:S ratios of dissolved species lie above 1:1 at most locations, regardless of whether CH4 exists in shallow sediment. However, sites with CH4 have 606 considerably more negative $DIC* \delta^{13}C-DIC$ values. Notably, all CESS stations, except S31 on the 607 Lomonosov Ridge, have modest $DIC* \delta^{13}C-DIC$ values.

In summary, from general pore water considerations as well as from comparisons to pore water profiles at other locations, sediments along the CESS continental slope do not contain significant CH4 in shallow sediment. Implicit in this finding is that sediment sequences along the CESS lack large-scale gas hydrate. As models for gas hydrate occurrence in the Arctic (Fig. 1)

correctly predict gas hydrate in several regions (e.g., Kvenvolden and Grantz, 1990; Max and Lowrie, 1993; Max and Johnson, 2012), our findings prompt an interesting question: why are predictions so markedly wrong for the CESS?

5.6 Possible explanations for methane absence

To understand the absence of gas hydrates on the CESS, one needs to consider the generalities of gas hydrate occurrence in marine sediment. There are two basic conditions for gas hydrate on continental slopes (Kvenvolden, 1993; Dickens, 2001). The first is the "potential volume", or the pore space where physiochemical conditions (e.g., temperature, pressure, salinity, sediment porosity) are amenable to gas hydrate formation. As stressed in previous works, the CESS, with cold bottom water and a low geothermal gradient, has a relatively large volume of sediment with appropriate gas hydrate stability conditions (Stranne et al., 2016). The second is the "occupancy", or the fraction of sediment pore space with sufficient CH4 to precipitate gas hydrate. The short answer is that environmental conditions on the CESS are highly conducive for gas hydrate, but there is little CH4.

It is also important to recognize how diffusive systems operate in marine sediment. Hundreds of pore water profiles have been generated during scientific ocean drilling expeditions, including scores into CH4 charged sediment sequences. These profiles almost universally show connectivity of pore water chemistry over hundreds of meters (Fig. 3). This occurs because, given sufficient permeability and time, diffusive fluxes transport species from intervals of high concentration to intervals of low concentration. Hence, unless some impermeable layer exists in the sediment sequence, even CH4 at depth impacts near seafloor concentrations. Indeed, ODP Leg 164 on the outer Blake Ridge wonderfully shows this phenomenon. The uppermost gas

hydrate in sediment in this region probably lies at about 190 mbsf; nonetheless, its presence can be observed in shallow pore water profiles, because the flux of CH4 from depth drives AOM near the seafloor (Borowski et al., 1999; Dickens, 2001).

For these reasons, bubble-mediated CH4 transport from widespread gas hydrates occurring between transects is unlikely. No major physiographic provinces exist between transects (Fig. 1 and 2). All major sedimentary regions within the field area are included within the transects. All observed large-scale gas hydrate accumulations with bubble-mediated CH4 transport also have significant CH4 diffusion. This is because sediment sequences with gas hydrate have gas hydrate formation, gas hydrate dissociation, and gas hydrate dissolution all co-occurring (Dickens, 2003). The pore water gradients between the top of the gas hydrate stability zone and the seafloor occur due to steady-state formation and dissolution. Therefore, it is unlikely that widespread gas hydrate accumulations exist and are somehow only venting in small localized regions. Therefore, assuming that an impermeable layer does not exist in the upper few hundreds of meters of sediment on slopes of the CESS, the lack of gas hydrates and CH4 suggests either insufficient POC to generate CH4, or substantial loss of CH4 over time. The accumulation of POC on CESS slopes may be relatively low over the Plio-Pleistocene, an amount too small to drive methanogenesis. With low POC inputs, other microbial reactions can exhaust the organic matter needed for methanogenesis. This may, in fact, explain why the pore water chemistry suggests that metal-oxide reduction dominates the geochemical 654 environment at most stations on the CESS. Additionally, Ba^{2+} concentrations do not provide evidence for bio-barite dissolution. Without further investigation, we can offer three possibilities

past glacial intervals, greatly diminishes primary production within the water column, one may

as to why this might occur: (1) significant sea-ice concentrations, both at present-day and during

ask, however, why this process would hinder production above CESS sediments and not above other Arctic provinces with demonstrated gas hydrate accumulations; (2) the extremely broad continental shelf prevents large accumulations of terrestrial organic rich sediment from reaching the slope, the enormous continental shelf, is indeed, the primary dissimilarity to other Arctic margins; or (3) highly variable sediment accumulation, perhaps corresponding to glacial-interglacial oscillations, creates a situation where organic matter can be consumed during intervals of low deposition. In the latter case, large glaciers in the past may have physically removed sediment (and organic matter) from the slope (Jakobsson et al., 2014).

There is also the issue of POC that likely accumulated in the Cretaceous through early Eocene (Sluijs et al., 2006; Backman et al., 2009). In theory, organic-rich sediment accumulated around the Arctic during this time, which should have generated CH4. This CH4 could either be too deeply buried to migrate into the modern GHSZ or has been lost in the intervening time.

6. Conclusions

Leg 2 of the SWERUS-C3 expedition recovered sediments and pore waters from numerous stations across the CESS continental slope. These stations extend from Wrangel Island to the New Siberian Islands, and give information from a climatically sensitive but highly inaccessible area.

In an effort to understand CH4 cycling on the CESS continental slope, we generated detailed pore water profiles of multiple dissolved constituents at the stations. The pore water 678 profiles are coherent and interpretable, and give a general view: most stations have low SO_4^2 and 679 HCO₃⁻ fluxes (<6.2 and 6.8 mol/m²-kyr respectively), a moderate decrease in δ^{13} C-DIC values 680 with depth (-3.6‰/m average), no dissolved H₂S, moderate rise in HPO₄²⁻ and NH₄

681 concentrations, and slightly decreasing Ca^{2+} , Mg²⁺, and Sr²⁺ concentrations. Except for one station on the Lomonosov Ridge, metal oxide reduction appears to be the dominant geochemical environment affecting shallow sediment, and there is no evidence for upward diffusing CH4. These results strongly suggest that gas hydrates do not occur on slopes of the CESS. This directly conflicts with multiple publications, which have assumed large quantities of CH4 and gas hydrate in the region. It is possible that CH4 and gas hydrate occur where the Lomonosov Ridge intersects the CESS.

The contradiction between models for gas hydrate in the region and actual data may arise for two basic reasons. First, in relatively recent geological times, insufficient POC accumulates along the slope to form CH4 and gas hydrates; second, CH4 generated from POC deposited in older geological times is too deeply buried or has been lost.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank the SWERUS-C3 Leg 2 crew as well as reviewers.

- **Table List**
- **Table 1** QA/QC
- **Table 2** Published and Calculated Fluxes
- 699 a = Coffin et al., 2013; b = Personal Communication; c = Coffin et al., 2007; $d = \text{Coffin et al.}$
- 700 2006; $e = \text{Coffin et al., } 2008$; $f = \text{Hamdan et al., } 2011$ and $\text{Coffin et al., } 2014$; $g = \text{Dickens and }$
- 701 Snyder, 2009; h= Snyder et al., 2007; $i =$ Mountain et al., 1994; $j =$ Lin et al., 2006; $k =$ Berelson
- 702 et al., ; l = Hensen et al., 2003 ; m = Dickens, 2001 ; n = Geprags et al., 2016 ; o = Claypool et
- al., 2006; p = Keigwin et al., 1998; q = Berg, 2008; r = Borowski et al., 2000; s = D'Hondt et al.,
- 2002; t = D'Hondt et al., 2004; u = Torres et al., 2009; v = Burns, 1998; w = Kastner et al., 2008;
- 705 $x = Paul1$ et al., 1996; $y = Flood$ et al., 1995; $z = W$ efer et al., 1998; 1 = Prell et al., 1998; 2 =
- Takahashi et al., 2011; 3 = Riedel et al., 2006; 4 = Tamaki et al., 1990; 5 = Lyle et al., 1997; 6 =
- 707 Moore et al., 2001; 7 = Kimura et al., 1997; 8 = Suess et al., 1988; 9 = D'Hondt et al., 2003. \dot{x} =
- Calculated from published material.
-
-

Figure Captions

- **Figure 1.** Generalized Arctic map with background from GeoMapApp
- (http://www.geomapapp.org; Ryan et al., 2009). Observed sulfate-methane transitions during the
- MITAS 1 expedition shown in black diamonds (Coffin et al., 2013) and Arctic Coring
- Expedition (ACEX) shown as red squares (Backman et al., 2009).
-
- **Figure 2.** Bathymetric map of Eurasian Arctic showing the overall cruise track of Leg 2 along
- with the four transects and coring locations. Multicores shown as yellow triangles, gravity and
- piston cores as white stars, and the ship trackline as gray line from Barrow, Alaska.
-
- **Figure 3.** Idealized pore water concentration profiles for high and low upward methane flux.
- Discrete data points for sites 722 (Arabian Sea; Seifert and Michaelis, 1991; D'Hondt et al.,
- 2002) and 1230 (offshore Peru; Donohue et al., 2006) are given as reference.
-
- **Figure 4.** Transect 1. results. IAPSO standard seawater (black dotted line) shown for
- comparison.

- PC02-PC14, Coffin et al., 2008; 994-997, 1059, Borowski et al., 2000; Paull et al., 2000; 1326
- and 1329, Torres and Kastner, 2009; GC233 and GB425, Hu et al., 2010; D-5 D-8 and D-F, Hu
- et al., 2015; C9-C19, Luo et al., 2013; PC-07, Smith and Coffin, 2014; 1230, Shipboard
- Scientific Party, 2003; 1244 and 1247, Claypool et al., 2006; 1305 and 1306, Party, 2005)
- including global sites for comparison) showing the paucity of methane charged sites actually
- reaching 1:1 C:S ratio. Error bars are one sigma. CESS plotted pore waters substitute alkalinity
- for DIC. With the absence of sulfide, DIC and alkalinity should be roughly equivalent in these
- pore waters. CESS locations use the same symbols as previous figures.

References:

- Aagaard, K., Coachman, L. K., and Carmack, E. C.: On the halocline of the Arctic Ocean, Deep Sea Res., 28, 529-545, 1981.
- Aagaard, K. and Carmack, E. C.: The role of sea ice and other fresh water in the Arctic Circulation, J. Geophys. Res., 94, 14485–14498, 1989.
- Aharon, P. and Fu, B.: Microbial sulfate reduction rates and sulfur and oxygen isotope
- fractionations at oil and gas seeps in deepwater Gulf of Mexico. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 64(2), pp.233-246, 2000.
- Alekseev, M. N.: Paleogeography and geochronology in the Russian eastern arctic during the

second half of the quaternary, Quatern. Int., 41/42, 11–15, 1997.

- Alperin, M. J., Reeburgh, W. S., and Whiticar, M. J.: Carbon and hydrogen isotope fractionation resulting from anaerobic methane oxidation, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 2, 279-288, 1988.
- Andreassen, K., Hogstad, K., and Berteussen, K. A.: Gas hydrate in the southern Barents Sea indicated by a shallow seismic anomaly, First Break, 8, 235–245, 1990.
- Andreev, A. A., Grosse, G., Schirrmeister, L., Kuznetsova, T. V., Kuzmina, S. A., Bobrov, A.
- A., Tarasov, P. E., Novenko, E., Yu., Meyer, H., Derevyagin, A., Yu., Kienast, F.,
- Bryantseva, A., and Kunitsky, V. V.: Weichselian and Holocene palaeoenvironmental
- history of the Bol'shoy Lyakhovsky Island, New Siberian Archipelago, Arctic Siberia. Boreas 38, 72–110, 2009.
- Archer, D. E.: Methane hydrate stability and anthropogenic climate change, Biogeosciences, 4, 993-1057, 2007.
- Archer, D.: A model of the methane cycle, permafrost, and hydrology of the Siberian continental margin, Biogeosciences, 12 (10), 2953–2974, 2015.

- Berner, R. A.: Diagenetic models of dissolved species in the interstitial waters of compacting sediments, Am. J. Sci., 275, 88–96, 1975.
- Berner, R. A.: Stoichiometric models for nutrient regeneration m anoxic sediment?, Limnology, 22, 781-786, 1977.
- 817 Berner, R. A.: Early Diagenesis: A Theoretical Approach, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 818 N. J., 1980.
- 819 Bhatnagar, G., Chatterjee, S., Chapman, W. G., Dugan, B., Dickens, G. R., and Hirasaki G. J.:
- Analytical theory relating the depth of the sulfate‐methane transition to gas hydrate distribution and saturation, Geochem. Geophy. Geosy., 12, 1-21, 2011.
- Biastoch, A., Treude, T., Ruepke, L. H., Riebesell, U., Roth, C., Burwicz, E. B., Park, W., Latif,
- M., Boening, C. W., Madec, G., and Wallmann, K.: Rising Arctic Ocean temperatures
- cause gas hydrate destabilization and ocean acidification, Geophys. Res. Lett., 38, 1-5,
- 2011.
- Boetius, A., Ravenschlag, K., Schubert, C. J., Rickert, D., Widdel, F., Gieseke, A., Amann, R.,
- Jørgensen, B. B., Witte, U. and Pfannkuche, O.: A marine microbial consortium

apparently mediating anaerobic oxidation of methane, Nature, 407, 623-626, 2000.

- 829 Borowski, W. S., Paull, C. K., and Ussler III, W.: Marine porewater sulfate profiles indicate in situ methane flux from underlying gas hydrate, Geol. 24, 655– 658, 1996.
- Borowski, W. S., Paull, C. K., and Ussler W. III: Global and local variations of interstitial sulfate gradients in deepwater, continental margin sediments: Sensitivity to underlying methane and gas hydrates, Mar. Geol., 159, 131–154, 1999.

- Climatology, Oceanography, Geology and Biology, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 657-720, 1989.
- Dehairs, F., Chesselet, R., and Jedwab, J.: Discrete suspended particles of barite and the barium cycle in the ocean, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett., 49, 528–550, 1980.
- Devol, A. H.: Are high rates of sulphate reduction associated with anaerobic oxidation of methane?, Nature, 291, 407-408, 1981.
- Dickens, G. R., Paull, C. K. and Wallace, P.: Direct measurement of in situ methane quantities in a large gas hydrate reservoir. Nature, 385, 426-428, 1997.
- Dickens, G. R.: Sulfate profiles and barium fronts in sediment on the Blake Ridge. Present and
- past methane fluxes through a large gas hydrate reservoir, Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac., 65, 529-543, 2001.
- Dickens, G. R.: Rethinking the global carbon cycle with a large, dynamic and microbially mediated gas hydrate capacitor. EPSL, 213 (3), 169-183, 2003.
- Dickens, G. R.: Rhizon sampling of pore waters on scientific drilling expeditions: an example
- from the IODP Expedition 302, Arctic Coring Expedition (ACEX). Sci. Drill 4, 22–25, 2007.
- Dickens, G.R. and Snyder, G.T.: Interpreting upward methane flux from marine pore water

profiles, In: Fire in the Ice, NETL Methane Hydrate Newsletter 9 (1), 7-10, 2009.

- D'Hondt, S., Rutherford, S., and Spivack, A. J.: Metabolic activity of subsurface life in deep-sea sediments, Science, 295, 2067–2070, 2002.
- Dmitrenko, I. A., Polyakov, I. V., Kirillov, S. A., Timokhov, L. A., Frolov, I. E., Sokolov, V. T.,
- Simmons, H. L., Ivanov, V. V., and Walsh, D.: Toward a warmer Arctic Ocean:

- Jokat, W. and Ickrath, M.: Structure of ridges and basins off East Siberia along 81° N, Arctic Ocean, Mar. Petrol. Geol., 64, 222-232, 2015.
- Joye, S. B., Boetius, A., Orcutt, B. N., Montoya, J. P., Schulz, H. N., Erickson, M. J. and Lugo,
- S.K.: The anaerobic oxidation of methane and sulfate reduction in sediments from Gulf of Mexico cold seeps. Chemical Geology, 205 (3), 219-238, 2004.
- Jenkyns, H. C., Forster, A., Schouten, S., and Sinninghe Damsté, J. S.: High temperatures in the Late Cretaceous Arctic Ocean, Nature, 432, 888–892, 2004.
- Judge, A. S.: Natural gas hydrates in Canada, In: M.H. French (Editor), Proceedings of the
- Fourth Canadian Permafrost Conference 1981, Roger J.E. Brown Memorial Volume,
- National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, Ont., 320-328, 1982.
- Kastner, M., Claypool, G., and Robertson, G.: Geochemical constraints on the origin of the pore fluids and gas hydrate distribution at Atwater Valley and Keathley Canyon, northern Gulf of Mexico, Mar. Petr. Geol., 25, 860–872, 2008a.
- Kastner, M., Torres, M., Solomon, E., and Spivack, A. J.: Marine pore fluid profiles of dissolved
- sulfate; do they reflect in situ methane fluxes?, In: Fire in the Ice, NETL Methane
- Hydrate Newsletter, Summer, 2008b.
- Keigwin, L. D., Rio, D., Acton, G. D., and Shipboard Scientific Party: Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Initial Reports, 172: College Station, TX (Ocean Drilling Program), 1998.
- Kimura, G., Silver, E. A., Blum, P., Shipboard Scientific Party: Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Initial Reports, Vol. 170, 1997.
- Klauda, J. B. and Sandler, S. I.: Global distribution of methane hydrate in ocean sediment, Energy Fuel, 19, 469–78, 2005.

Kvenvolden, K. A., and Grantz, A.: Gas hydrates in the Arctic Ocean region, in The Arctic

- Ocean Region, Geology of North America, Geol. Soc. of Am., Boulder, Colo., 539-549, 1990.
- Kvenvolden, K. A.: Gas hydrates: Geological perspective and global change, Rev. Geophys., 31, 173–187, 1993.

Kvenvolden, K. A. and Lorenson, T. D.: The global occurrence of natural gas hydrate. In: Paull,

- C. K., Dillon, W. P. (Eds.), Natural Gas Hydrates: Occurrence, Distribution, and Detection, AGU Geophy. Monograph Ser., 124, 3–18, 2001.
- Laberg, J. S. and Andreassen, K.: Gas hydrate and free gas indications within the Cenozoic succession of the Bojornya Basin, western Barents Sea, Mar. Petrol. Geol., 13, 921-940, 1996.
- Laberg, J. S., Andreassen, K., and Knutsen, S. M.: Inferred gas hydrate on the Barents Sea shelf a model for its formation and a volume estimate, Geo-Mar. Lett., 18, 26–33, 1998.
- Lerman, A.: Migrational processes and chemical reactions in Sulfate profiles and barium fronts in sediment 539 interstitial waters, In The Sea, Volume VI (ed. E. D. Goldberg), Wiley,
- New York, 695-738, 1977.
- Li, Y-H. and Gregory, S.: Diffusion of ions in sea sediments. Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac., 38, 703-714, 1974.

- Makogon, Y. F.: Natural gas hydrates–A promising source of energy, J. Nat. Gas Sc. Eng., 2, 49- 59, 2010.
- Malinverno, A. and Pohlman, J. W.: Modeling sulfate reduction in methane hydrate-bearing
- continental margin sediments: does a sulfate-methane transition require anaerobic
- oxidation of methane, Geochem. Geophy. Geosy., 12, 1-18, 2011.
- März, C., Stratmann, A., Matthiessen, J., Meinhardt, A. K., Eckert, S., Schnetger, B., Vogt, C.,
- Stein, R. and Brumsack, H. J.: Manganese-rich brown layers in Arctic Ocean sediments:
- composition, formation mechanisms, and diagenetic overprint. Geochimica et
- Cosmochimica Acta, 75 (23), 7668-7687, 2011.
- Max, M. D. and Lowrie, A.: Natural gas hydrates: Arctic and Nordic Sea potential. Arctic
- geology and petroleum potential, proceedings of the Norwegian Petroleum Society
- conference, 15-17 August 1990, Tromsø, Norway. No. 2. Elsevier Science Ltd., 1993.
- Max, M. D. and Johnson, A. H.: Natural Gas Hydrate (NGH) Arctic Ocean potential prospects and resource base, OTC Arctic Technology Conference, 27-53, 2012.
- McGuire, A. D., Anderson, L. G., Christensen, T. R., Dallimore, S., Guo, L. D., Hayes, D. J.,
- Heimann, M., Lorenson, D. D., MacDonald, R. W., and Roulet, N.: Sensitivity of the
- carbon cycle in the Arctic to climate change, Ecol. Monogr., 79, 523–555, 2009.
- Miles, P. R.: Potential distribution of methane hydrate beneath the European continental margins, Geophys. Res. Lett., 22, 3179-3182, 1995.
- Miller, C., Vasconcelos, K.L., Little, D.N. and Bhasin, A.: Investigating aspects of aggregate
- properties that influence asphalt mixtures performance. Research Report for DTFH61-06-
- C-00021, Texas A&M University at College Station and The University of Texas at
- Austin, Texas, 2011.

Jokat, W., Nam, S.-I., and Kang, S.-H.: Repeated Pleistocene glaciation of the East

Siberian Continental Margin, Nat. Geosci., 6, 842-846, 2013.

sediment drift, Mar. Petrol. Geol., 1–14, 2010.

- Phrampus, B. J., Hornbach, M. J., Ruppel, C. D., and Hart P. E.: Widespread gas hydrate instability on the upper US Beaufort margin, J. Geophys. Res-Sol. Ea., 119, 8594–8609, 2014.
- Piñero, E., Marquardt, M., Hensen, C., Haeckel, M., and Wallmann K.: Estimation of the global
- inventory of methane hydrates in marine sediments using transfer functions,
- Biogeosciences 10, 959–975, 2013.
- Pohlman, J. W., Riedel, M., Waite, W., Rose, K., and Lapham, L.: Application of Rhizon
- samplers to obtain high-resolution pore-fluid records during geo-chemical investigations
- of gas hydrate systems, Fire in the Ice: Methane Hydrate Newsletter, US Department of Energy/National Energy Technology Laboratory, Fall, 2008.
- Posewang, J. and Mienert, J.: High-resolution seismic studies of gas hydrates west of Svalbard, Geo-Mar. Lett., 19, 150–156, 1999.
- Prell, W. L., Niitsuma, N., and Shipboard Scientific Party: Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling
- Program, Initial Reports, 117: College Station, TX (Ocean Drilling Program), 1998.
- Rachor, E.: The expedition ARK-XI/1 of RV" Polarstern" in 1995: [ARK XI/1, Bremerhaven-

Tromsø-, 07.07. 1995-20.09. 1995]. Berichte zur Polarforschung (Reports on Polar Research), 226, 1995.

- Reagan, M. T. and Moridis, G. J.: Dynamic response of oceanic hydrate deposits to ocean temperature change, J. Geophys. Res., 113, 1-21, 2008.
- Reagan, M. T. and Moridis, G. J.: Large-scale simulation of methane hydrate dissociation along 1227 the West Spitsbergen margin, Geophys. Res. Lett., 36, 1-5, 2009.
- Redfield, A. C.: The biological control of chemical factors in the environment, Am. Sci., 46, 221-230, 1958.
- Regnier, P., Dale, A. W., Arndt, S., LaRowe, D. E., Mogollón, J., and Van Cappellen, P.:
- Quantitative analysis of anaerobic oxidation of methane (AOM) in marine sediments: a modeling perspective, Earth-Sci. Rev., 106, 105-130, 2011.
- Reeburgh, W. S.: Methane consumption in Cariaco Trench waters and sediments, Earth Planet Sci. Lett., 28, 337–344, 1976.
- Riedel, M., Collett, T.S., Malone, M.J., and the Expedition 311 Scientists Proceedings of the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program, Volume 311, 2006.

Riedinger, N., Formolo, M. J., Lyons, T. W., Henkel, S., Beck, A., and Kasten, S.: An inorganic

- geochemical argument for coupled anaerobic oxidation of methane and iron reduction in marine sediments, Geobiology, 12, 172-181, 2014.
- Rudels, B., Muench, R. D., Gunn, J., Schauer, U., and Friedrich, H. J.: Evolution of the Arctic Ocean boundary current north of the Siberian shelves, Journal of Marine Systems, 25, 1, 77-99, 2000.
- Ryan, W. B. F., Carbotte, S. M., Coplan, J. O., O'Hara, S., Melkonian, A., Arko, R., Weissel, R.
- A., Ferrini, V., Goodwillie, A., Nitsche, F., Bonczkowski, J., and Zemsky, R.: Global

Multi-Resolution Topography synthesis, Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst., 10, 1-9, 2009.

- Schrum, H. S., Murray, R. S., and Gribsholt B.: Comparison of rhizon sampling and whole round squeezing for marine sediment porewater, Sci. Drill., 13, 47–50, 2012.
- Schulz, H. D.: Quantification of early diagenesis: dissolved constituents in marine pore water, In Mar. Geochem., Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 85-128, 2000.
- Seeberg-Elverfeldt, J., Schlüter, M., Feseker, T., and Kölling, M.: Rhizon sampling of pore
- waters near the sediment/water interface of aquatic systems, Limnol. Oceanogr. Methods, 3, 361-371, 2005.
- Seifert, R. and Michaelis, W.: Organic compounds in sediments and pore waters of Sites 723 and
- 724, In Prell, W.L., Niitsuma, N., et al., Proc. ODP, Sci. Results, 117: College Station,
- TX (ODP), 529–545, 1991.
- Serreze, M. C., Walsh, J. E., Chapin, III F. S., Osterkamp, T., Dyurgerov, M., Romanovsky, V.,
- Oechel, W. C., Morison, J., Zhang T., and Barry, R. B.: Observational evidence of recent change in the northern high-latitude environment, Climatic Change, 46, 159–207, 2000.
- Semiletov, I., Makshtas, O. A., Akasofu, S.I., and Andreas, E. L.: Atmospheric CO2 balance: the role of Arctic sea ice, Geophys. Res. Lett., 31, 1-4, 2004.
- Shakhova, N, Semiletov, I, Salyuk, A, Yusupov, V, Kosmach, D, and Gustafsson, Ö.: Extensive Methane venting to the atmosphere from sediments of the East Siberian arctic shelf, 1266 Science, 327, 1246–1250, 2010a.
- Shakhova, N., Semiletov, I., Leifer, I., Rekant, P., Salyuk, A., and Kosmach, D.: Geochemical
- and geophysical evidence of methane release from the inner East Siberian Shelf, J. Geophys. Res., 115, 1-14, 2010b.
- Sher, A. V., Kuzmina, S. A., Kuznetsova, T. V., and Sulerzhitsky, L. D.: New insights into the Weichselian environment and climate of the East Siberian Arctic, derived from fossil insects, plants, and mammals, Quaternary Sci. Rev., 24, 533 – 569, 2005.
- Shipboard Scientific Party: Leg 201 summary, In D'Hondt, S.L., Jørgensen, B.B., Miller, D.J., et
- al., Proc. ODP, Init. Repts., 201: College Station TX (Ocean Drilling Program), 1–81, 2003.
- Sluijs, A., Schouten, S., Pagani, M., Woltering, M., Brinkhuis, H., Damsté, J.S.S., Dickens, G.R.,
- Huber, M., Reichart, G.J., Stein, R. and Matthiessen, J.,: Subtropical Arctic Ocean
- temperatures during the Palaeocene/Eocene thermal maximum. Nature, 441 (7093), 610-
- 613, 2006.

- Snyder, G. T., Hiruta, A., Matsumoto, R., Dickens, G. R., Tomaru, H., Takeuchi, R.,
- Komatsubara, J., Ishida, Y., and Yu, H.: Porewater profiles and authigenic mineralization
- in shallow marine sediments above the methane-charged system on Umitaka Spur, Japan Sea. Deep-Sea Research II 54, 1216–1239, 2007.
- Soloviev, V. A.: Gas-hydrate-prone areas of the ocean and gas-hydrate accumulations, Journal of 1288 the Conference Abstracts, 6, 158, 2002.
- Spielhagen, R. F., Werner, K., Sorensen, S. A., Zamelczyk, K., Kandiano, E., Budeus, G.,
- Husum, K., Marchitto, T. M., and Hald, M.: Enhanced modern heat transfer to the Arctic by warm Atlantic water, Science 331, 450-453, 2011.
- Stein, R., Boucsein, B., and Meyer, H.: Anoxia and high primary production in the Paleogene
- central Arctic Ocean: First detailed records from Lomonosov Ridge, Geophys. Res. Lett., 33, 1-6, 2006.
- Stein, R.: Arctic Ocean sediments: processes, proxies, and paleoenvironment, Developments in Mar. Geol., 2. Elsevier, Amsterdam. 592, 2008.
- Stranne, C., O'Regan, M., Dickens, G. R., Crill, P., Miller, C., Preto, P., and Jakobsson, M.:
- Dynamic simulations of potential methane release from East Siberian continental slope sediments, Geochem. Geophy. Geosy., 17, 872-886, 2016.
- Stroeve, J. C., Serreze, M. C., Holland, M. M., Kay, J. E., Malanik, J., and Barrett, A. P.: The
- Arctic's rapidly shrinking sea ice cover: a research synthesis, Climatic Change, 110,

1005-1027, 2012.

- 1329 Torres, M. E. and Kastner M.: Data report: Clues about carbon cycling in methane-bearing
- sediments using stable isotopes of the dissolved inorganic carbon, IODP Expedition 311, 1331 Proceedings of the IODP, 311, 2009.
- Treude, T., Krause, S., Maltby, J., Dale, A.W., Coffin, R. and Hamdan, L.J.: Sulfate reduction

and methane oxidation activity below the sulfate-methane transition zone in Alaskan

- Beaufort Sea continental margin sediments: Implications for deep sulfur cycling.
- Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 144, 217-237, 2014.
- Troup, B. N., Bricker, O. P., and Bray, J. T.: Oxidation effect on the analysis of iron in the interstitial water of recent anoxic sediments, Nature 249, 237-239, 1974.
- Ussler, W. and Paull, C.K.: Rates of anaerobic oxidation of methane and authigenic carbonate

mineralization in methane-rich deep-sea sediments inferred from models and

geochemical profiles. Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 266(3), 271-287, 2008.

Vanneste, M., Guidard, S., and Mienert, J.: Bottom-simulating reflections and geothermal

gradients across the western Svalbard margin, Terra Nova, 17, 510–516, 2005.

Wallmann, K., Pinero, E., Burwicz, E., Haeckel, M., Hensen, C., Dale, A. W., and Ruepke, L.:

The global inventory of methane hydrate in marine sediments: A theoretical approach, Energies, 5, 2449–2498, 2012.

Weaver, J. S. and Stewart, J. M.: In-situ hydrates under the Beaufort Sea Shelf, In: M.H. French

(Editor), Proceedings of the Fourth Canadian Permafrost Conference 1981, Roger J. E.

Brown Memorial Volume, Nat. Res. Council Can., Ottawa, Ont., 312-319, 1982.

- Whiticar, M. J.: Carbon and hydrogen isotope systematics of bacterial formation and oxidation of methane. Chemical Geology, 161 (1), 291-314, 1999.
- Woodgate R. A., Aaagard, K., Muench, R. D., Gunn, J., Björk, G., Rudels, B., Roach, A. T., and Schauer, U.: The Arctic Ocean boundary current along the Eurasian slope and the

adjacent Lomonosov Ridge: Water mass properties, transports and transformation from moored instruments, Deep Sea Research, 48, 1757-1792, 2001.

- Yamamoto, K. and Dallimore, S.: Aurora-JOGMEC-NRCan Mallik 2006–2008 Gas Hydrate
- Research Project progress. In: Fire in the Ice, NETL Methane Hydrate Newsletter, Summer 2008, 1–5, 2008.
- Ye, H., Yang, T., Zhu, G., Jiang, S., and Wu, L.: Pore water geochemistry in shallow sediments from the northeastern continental slope of the South China Sea, Mar. Petrol. Geol., 75, 68-82, 2016.
- Yoshinaga, M. Y., Holler, T., Goldhammer, T., Wegener, G., Pohlman, J. W., Brunner, B.,
- Kuypers, M. M., Hinrichs, K. U. and Elvert, M.: Carbon isotope equilibration during
- sulphate-limited anaerobic oxidation of methane. Nature Geoscience, 7(3), 190-194,
- 2014.

- **Figures**
- **Figure 1.**

Figure 2.

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Idealized Pore Water Concentration Profiles

Figure 6.

Figure 8.

Figure 9.

Redfield Comparison with Marginal Distribution Curves

Figure 12.

1429

1430

1431

1432

1433

1434

1435

1436

1437

1438

1439 **Table 2.**

Table 2 - Reported and Calculated Fluxes

1440

1441